

APPENDIX A

SCOPING FOR THIS DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

This appendix displays the two Scoping Reports—previously published by NRC—that resulted from public meetings held on this project. Each of these scoping reports summarizes the comments and concerns received by the Cooperating Agencies at the public meetings. The scope and focus of this environmental impact statement was developed in part from the comments and concerns offered at the public meetings.

The first Scoping Report, dated September 1998, was prepared following a public meeting in Salt Lake City, Utah, on June 2, 1998. The second (or supplemental) report is dated November 1999 and was prepared following public meetings in Salt Lake City and Tooele, Utah, on April 29, 1999.

DOCKET 72-22

Environmental Impact Statement Scoping Process

Scoping Report

Private Fuel Storage Facility

Skull Valley Indian Reservation, Tooele County, Utah

September 1998



U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Rockville, Maryland

DOCKET 72-22

Environmental Impact Statement Scoping Process

Scoping Report

Private Fuel Storage Facility

Skull Valley Indian Reservation, Tooele County, Utah

September 1998



U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Rockville, Maryland

CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION	1
2. SUMMARY OF ISSUES RAISED DURING THE SCOPING PROCESS	3
2.1 OVERVIEW	3
2.2 SUMMARY OF ISSUES RAISED	4
2.2.1 Accidents	4
2.2.2 Transportation of Spent Fuel	4
2.2.3 Cumulative Impacts and Scope of the Analysis	5
2.2.4 Compliance with Applicable Local, State, and Federal Regulations	6
2.2.5 Geology and Seismicity	6
2.2.6 Hydrology (Surface Water and Groundwater)	7
2.2.7 Socioeconomics	7
2.2.8 Ecology	8
2.2.9 Cultural Resources and Environmental Justice	8
2.2.10 Need for the Facility	9
2.2.11 Radiological Impacts and Human Health and Safety	9
2.2.12 Emergency Preparedness	10
2.2.13 Decommissioning	10
2.2.14 Long-term Storage	10
2.2.15 Alternatives	10
2.3 OTHER SOURCES OF SCOPING-RELATED INFORMATION	11
3. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	12
3.1 SCOPE OF THE EIS	12
3.2 ISSUES OUTSIDE THE SCOPE OF THE EIS	14
Attachment A: Comment Subject Areas by Commentor, Oral and Written Comments	15
Attachment B: Proposed Outline for the Draft Environmental Impact Statement	23

1. INTRODUCTION

Private Fuel Storage L.L.C. (PFS), a company owned by seven U.S. electric utilities,¹ has applied to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) for a license to construct and operate an independent spent fuel storage installation (ISFSI). Pursuant to the Atomic Energy Act, as amended, and the Commission's regulations in Title 10 of the *Code of Federal Regulations*, PFS filed an application (Docket No. 72-22) with an accompanying Environmental Report on June 20, 1997, for a specific license to receive, transfer, and possess nuclear power reactor spent fuel and other radioactive material associated with spent nuclear fuel (SNF) storage in an ISFSI to be constructed and operated on the Skull Valley Indian Reservation in Tooele County, Utah. The proposed facility would be located on an 820-acre site leased from the Skull Valley Band of Goshute Indians approximately 27 miles west-southwest of the city of Tooele. The proposed facility would be designed to store SNF for an initial license period of 20 years that would be subject to renewal for an additional 20 years. The applicant anticipates that by the end of the 40-year period all SNF stored at the proposed facility would have been transferred offsite, and the ISFSI site would be decommissioned.

Pursuant to its regulations in 10 CFR Part 51, the NRC is preparing an environmental impact statement (EIS) on the proposed facility as part of its decision-making process. In addition to the EIS, the NRC is preparing a Safety Evaluation Report (SER) to address safety aspects of the proposed facility.

Both the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) and the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) have requested to be cooperating agencies in the preparation of the EIS. As trustees for the Skull Valley Band of the Goshute Indians, the BIA has responsibility to ensure that the interests of the tribe are not compromised by construction and operation of the proposed ISFSI. As manager of the Federal land adjacent to the proposed facility and over which rail access to the site might be built, the BLM has responsibility to represent the interests of the United States with regard to these lands.

The proposed facility would store SNF inside sealed canisters, which are enclosed in steel and concrete casks that provide shielding and additional mechanical protection to the fuel. The canister/cask-based system confines radioactive wastes and would be licensed by NRC in accordance with 10 CFR Part 72 requirements for storage of SNF. The proposed facility would store up to 40,000 metric tons of uranium (MTU) in a maximum of 4,000 casks. PFS proposes to begin construction of the facility in 2000 and to complete Phase 1 construction by the end of 2001. This phase of construction will provide an operational facility. Ownership and ultimate responsibility for the SNF would continue to remain with the utilities that generated it until such time as the fuel is transferred to the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE).

¹As per p. 1-10 of the PFS License Application, the members of the limited liability company are Genoa FuelTech, Inc., Indiana Michigan Power, Consolidated Edison Company of New York, GPU Nuclear Corporation, Northern States Power Company, Illinois Power Company, and Southern Nuclear Operating Company.

The scoping process was initiated on May 1, 1998, with the publication in the *Federal Register* of a Notice of Intent (NOI) to prepare an EIS and conduct the scoping process (63 *Fed. Reg.* 24197-98). As described in the NOI, the objectives of the scoping process are to

1. define the scope of the proposed action which is to be the subject of the EIS;
2. determine the scope of the EIS and identify significant issues to be analyzed in depth;
3. identify and eliminate from detailed study issues which are peripheral or are not significant;
4. identify any environmental assessments and other EISs which are being or will be prepared that are related to but not part of the scope of the EIS under consideration
5. identify other environmental review and consultation requirements related to the proposed action;
6. indicate the relationship between the timing of the environmental analyses and the Commission's tentative planning and decision-making schedule;
7. identify any cooperating agencies and, as appropriate, allocate assignments for preparation and schedules for completion of the EIS to the NRC and any cooperating agencies; and
8. describe the means by which the EIS will be prepared, including any contractor assistance to be used.

This report has been prepared to summarize the determinations and conclusions reached in the scoping process. Individuals and organizations who provided comments during the scoping period will receive a copy of this report. Following the publication of this report, the NRC staff will commence preparing a draft EIS. Oak Ridge National Laboratory is the contractor selected by NRC to provide technical assistance in the preparation of the EIS.

After publication of the draft EIS, the public will be invited to comment on that document. After evaluating comments on the draft EIS, NRC will issue a final EIS that will serve as the basis for the Commission's consideration of environmental impacts in its decision on licensing the proposed ISFSI and for issuance of decisions by cooperating agencies with authorizing actions. Section 2 of this report summarizes the comments and concerns expressed by government officials, agencies, and the public. Section 3 identifies the issues that the EIS will address and those issues that are not within the scope of the EIS. Where appropriate, Section 3 identifies other places in the decision-making process where issues that are outside the scope of the EIS may be considered.

2. SUMMARY OF ISSUES RAISED DURING THE SCOPING PROCESS

2.1 OVERVIEW

NRC held the Public Scoping Meeting for the EIS regarding the proposed ISFSI in Skull Valley, Utah, on June 2, 1998, in Salt Lake City. During the scoping meeting, 35 individuals offered comments about the proposed action. Of these 35 speakers, 3 were representing Federal agencies or organizations, 9 were representing State of Utah agencies or departments, and 23 spoke on behalf of other organizations or as private citizens. In addition, 30 written statements from individuals, organizations, and agencies were received during the scoping period. Some of these submittals were written statements or summaries of the verbal testimony. This active participation by the public in the scoping process is an important component of determining the major issues that the EIS should assess.

The individuals at the meeting offered comments and questions on several subject areas but primarily emphasized their concerns about risk and safety issues (e.g., transporting spent fuel and the potential for accidents during storage), the role of the Utah State government, and environmental impacts resulting from the construction and operation of the proposed facility. The comments and questions have been initially categorized into the following general topics:

- accidents;
- transportation of spent fuel;
- cumulative impacts and scope of the analysis;
- compliance with applicable local, State, and Federal regulations;
- geology and seismicity;
- hydrology (surface water and groundwater);
- socioeconomics (including land use, aesthetics, recreational resources and cost/benefit analyses);
- ecology;
- cultural resources and environmental justice;
- need for the facility;
- radiological impacts and human health and safety;
- emergency preparedness;
- decommissioning;
- long-term storage of spent fuel; and
- alternatives.

Attachment A to this report lists the commentors and, on the basis of the topics listed above, shows the subject areas covered by their comments. Attachment B contains a proposed outline for the draft EIS, which was developed after considering the oral and written scoping comments.

In addition to raising important issues about the potential environmental impacts of the proposed facility, some commentors offered opinions and concerns that typically would not be included in the subject matter of an EIS—these include, for example, general opinions about nuclear energy policy in the United States or issues that are more appropriately considered in the NRC's SER. Comments of this type are taken into consideration by the staff, but they do not point to significant

environmental issues to be analyzed. Such comments are categorized here as “out of scope.” Other statements may be relevant to the proposed action, but they have no direct bearing on the evaluation of alternatives or on the decision-making process involving the proposed action. For instance, general statements of support for or opposition to the proposed project fall into this category. Again, comments of this type have been noted but are not used in defining the scope and content of the EIS.

Section 2.2 summarizes the issues raised during the scoping process, many of which the staff has identified as having a direct bearing on the analysis of potential environmental impacts and the NRC’s related decision-making process. Section 2.3 briefly describes other sources of project-related information that were considered during the scoping process for the EIS.

2.2 SUMMARY OF ISSUES RAISED

2.2.1 Accidents

A common concern expressed pertaining to the proposed project is the potential for accidents. Of particular concern are accidents that would involve a significant radiological release that, in turn, could have serious human health, social, ecological, and economic impacts. Many commentors were concerned that such accidents could occur in the facility itself, during transport of spent fuel, in the Intermodal Transfer Facility (ITF) which would be located about 24 miles from the proposed facility, and while casks are being handled by various types of equipment.

Several commentors were concerned about cask testing, performance, and degradation, especially the potential for leaks, loss of containment, loss of helium from the canisters, and cask overheating. Natural phenomena (such as earthquakes, floods, and brush fires) and external events (such as plane crashes) were also believed to be capable of causing catastrophic accidents involving radiological releases. The lack of a hot cell in the facility and the potential for human error were seen as increasing the potential for accidents.

The threat of sabotage, either by an insider or by terrorists, was regarded as an important vulnerability of the facility and of transportation activities; and several commentors pointed out that the population of the region around the proposed project is expected to increase, potentially making the consequences of an accident more serious. Some commentors expressed concern that the proposed project itself may cause accidents that would affect other resources and create hazards for the public, such as the ignition of wildfires by the proposed railroad and the resultant hazards to fire fighters.

Many commentors felt that accident analysis should be broadly extended to cover all components of transporting and storing the spent fuel and that the analysis should be based upon accurate, reliable, and objective data and previous studies. A few commentors felt that new tests should be performed to ensure the reliability of the casks. Mitigation plans for accident consequences and considerations of the potentially significant costs of an accident were also seen as related to the environmental impact analysis for the facility.

2.2.2 Transportation of Spent Fuel

Many commentors were concerned about the number, type, and frequency of spent fuel shipments; and there were several comments about the large quantity of spent fuel to be shipped and stored. These commentors felt that the transport of high-level nuclear waste carries many

environmental and economic risks that have not been adequately evaluated in the site-specific context of the proposed action.

One commentor noted that transportation accidents—even those that do not involve a radiological release—may disrupt and adversely affect vital transportation routes in the region, resulting in attendant economic impacts. Other commentors mentioned that (1) DOE will be using the same transportation corridor for nuclear waste shipments, (2) Utah State legislation (HR 2083 and SB 196) may impose prohibitively high fees on transporting spent fuel within the State, and (3) public health resources would have to be used to inform affected members of the public who perceive that they are in danger from the shipments.

One commentor said that an accident involving spent fuel near the Great Salt Lake could result in serious impacts to wildlife. Some commentors indicated that all communities along transport corridors would be endangered and, further, that they may not have adequate emergency response capabilities. Commentors also felt that there were insufficient safeguards in place to prevent or mitigate accidents and to protect shipments from potential sabotage.

In addition, commentors felt that the EIS should evaluate the transportation of spent fuel comprehensively—that is, from the originating nuclear power plant to the proposed facility, by both truck and rail shipments, and in terms of the full range of potential impacts associated with transporting spent fuel. Of particular concern were the potential impacts on the public and on the emergency response capabilities in communities located along the transport corridors.

2.2.3 Cumulative Impacts and Scope of the Analysis

Commentors noted that the proposed site is located in an area of military, chemical-industrial, and waste disposal facilities, such as Dugway Proving Grounds, the Tooele chemical weapons depot, and a magnesium refining operation. Consequently, they felt that the proposed facility should be evaluated in the context of the collective, interrelated, and cumulative impacts of these facilities, especially because of accidents that have already occurred in the area and because of past and ongoing environmental insults and contamination.

Commentors suggested that the potential for accidents at the proposed site would be heightened by the proximity of the other hazardous facilities and by the presence of an Air Force base that performs low-altitude flights. A few commentors reported that residents of the area already have experienced increased risk and incidence rates for serious illnesses as a result of contamination and emissions from the nearby facilities and from nuclear weapons tests in that area in the 1950s. Some commentors argued that the impact assessment should include a large region around the proposed site because of the presence of other potentially hazardous facilities.

2.2.4 Compliance with Applicable Local, State, and Federal Regulations

Many commentors raised legal and regulatory questions regarding the proposed project. Some of those issues fall outside the scope of the EIS, such as DOE's statutory responsibilities regarding spent fuel management and transportation, contractual liabilities and responsibilities of the Skull Valley Band, the terms of the lease agreement with Band members, Tribal sovereignty laws, and the actions and responsibilities of BIA.

Some commentors felt that the proposed project should comply with all provisions of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act, and a few commentors felt that existing NRC regulations regarding the transportation of spent fuel and the operation of spent fuel storage facilities are inadequate to ensure the public safety. Commentors also pointed to legal and regulatory compliance issues that would be relevant to the proposed facility under the NEPA process. In particular, these include the need to comply with all applicable Federal, State, and local regulations covering environmental resources such as groundwater, air quality, effluents, waste, wetlands, and water and storm discharges.

Other commentors were concerned that construction and transportation activities associated with the proposed project would infringe on rights-of-way or trust lands owned by the State of Utah or by private citizens. Two commentors mentioned water rights as an issue that may affect the availability of any potable or process water required for the facility. One commentor said that relevant legislation, regulations, entitlements, and permits enacted or required by the State of Utah should be reviewed in detail and that the status of compliance with those requirements should be described.

A representative from BLM asked if that agency should be included as a cooperating agency in the preparation of the EIS and mentioned its potential role in key decisions about permits and other authorizations. Some commentors felt that NEPA regulations regarding scoping would require NRC to extend the comment period because the PFS application lacks sufficient detail. Another commentor mentioned that any existing or potential oil, mineral, or natural gas leases in the area should be identified and evaluated for their effect on the proposed project. One commentor stated that BIA should prepare an independent EIS regarding the lease agreement between the applicant and the Skull Valley Band of Goshutes.

2.2.5 Geology and Seismicity

Several commentors regarded geology and seismicity at the proposed site as critically important issues affecting the suitability of Skull Valley to host a spent nuclear fuel storage facility. The geologic conditions mentioned most often include the potential for large-magnitude earthquakes, ground motion, soil stability, and surface rupturing.

Commentors felt that the potential for earthquakes and ground motions in the area may be greater than the applicant has reported and that a more complete analysis of the faults and other geologic structures in the area is needed. One commentor, for example, recommended that PFS be required to collect data from a statewide strong-motion seismic information network for use in design and planning of the proposed facility. Other commentors felt that the design of the proposed facility and the casks is sufficient to prevent damage to or releases from the spent fuel in the event of a large earthquake.

2.2.6 Hydrology (Surface Water and Groundwater)

Several commentors felt that the effects of construction and operation of the proposed project on surface water and groundwater resources should be assessed in detail for both the site itself and the larger region around it. In addition, some commentors felt that the facility—during both routine and accident conditions—has the potential to contaminate water resources. One commentor stated that existing water supplies are “dirty,” and several others mentioned the issue of water rights and availability.

Other issues mentioned by commentors include the probable maximum flood (PMF), facility water usage requirements, water availability, effects on the water table and aquifer, and impacts on other water uses and users in the area. One commentor disagreed with the PMF calculation in the license application, saying that the drainage basin described by the applicant as 26 square miles in area is actually closer to 240 square miles. The same commentor noted that floods have occurred in the area and that during those floods, the land depressions south of the access road were filled, the ground was saturated, and much of Skull Valley produced significant amounts of runoff.

2.2.7 Socioeconomics

Some commentors acknowledged that the proposed project may have positive economic effects on the resident Tribal population, but they also expressed concerns about allowing these positive effects to overshadow the negative social and economic consequences of the proposed action. Socioeconomic issues mentioned include effects of the proposed facility on (1) nearby property values, (2) the local tax base, (3) residential and commercial development in the region, (4) agriculture, (5) beef production, and (6) regional employment. A few commentors suggested that the mere presence of the facility may induce these adverse socioeconomic impacts because of the negative public perceptions that are attached to nuclear waste storage.

Some commentors were particularly concerned about the costs associated with accidents at the facility and the economic burdens that could be placed on the Tribe or the State if costly cleanup activities were required. Other commentors felt that there are too many unknowns in the potential costs of the project to allow for an accurate cost determination, and one commentor said that the cost/benefit analysis must thoroughly evaluate the cost and risks of the proposed project in comparison with the costs of storing the spent fuel at the nuclear power plants. One commentor suggested that financial assistance should be given to affected communities to mitigate potential economic impacts of the proposed facility.

Although the proposed project may induce positive socioeconomic impacts, some commentors were concerned that those economic benefits would not be distributed fairly, would be inadequate compensation for the degree of risk involved, and would be insufficient to cover any costs the Tribe may incur as a result of hosting the proposed facility.

Some commentors stated that the cost/benefit analysis should cover the life of the project and should include the cost of on-site storage at the power plants, the specifics of State-imposed restrictions, the costs of transportation, and the specific costs of all phases of the project, including decommissioning. One commentor stated that the cost/benefit analysis should include an evaluation of the financial impact of the proposed project on ratepayers at the PFS member utilities.

A few commentors were concerned about the effect of the proposed project on land use and values in the area, particularly public lands (such as State-administered Trust lands) and rights-of-way, that may be disturbed or degraded during construction and operation of the facility and during transportation activities. Others noted that the proposed project may alter the land use patterns of the

area and set an undesirable precedent for future land use. Also, commentors mentioned livestock grazing and the extensive agricultural and ranch lands in the vicinity and were concerned about potential adverse impacts on these resources. Some commentors felt that the proposed project would interfere with future land use and development in the area.

Several commentors noted that Skull Valley is a valuable and attractive ecosystem that is too often inaccurately described as “barren.” These commentors see the wildlife and vegetation in the region as valuable resources that must be preserved and protected for the enjoyment of current and future residents and visitors.

Similarly, some commentors were concerned about the effects of the proposed facility on recreational resources and tourism. Nearby wilderness areas and historic sites and trails, for example, have recreational value; and the Valley is an educational resource for wildlife observation, including the study of raptors.

2.2.8 Ecology

Commentors expressed several concerns about the impacts of all phases of the proposed project on plant and animal species of the region. One commentor said that some mitigation measures being discussed could possibly minimize those impacts but felt that a greater effort should be made to identify and address unintended impacts on wildlife migration patterns, critical habitats, and the potential for unavoidable impacts on wildlife and its habitat.

One commentor suggested that the EIS include an assessment of the proposed facility’s effects on wetlands and the grazing patterns of domestic livestock. The commentor further expressed concern about the potential impacts of toxic spills or other environmental contamination of the Great Salt Lake, which he said is a unique ecosystem of international importance. The commentor noted that the lake has been designated as a western hemispheric shore bird reserve because of its importance to migratory wildlife and that it supports brine shrimp harvest and mineral extraction industries that are important to the State’s economy. Two other sites near the proposed facility were also mentioned as ecologically significant areas (Timpie Springs and Horseshoe Springs) because of their importance to migratory birds and other wildlife that use these isolated areas. Commentors further mentioned that the project may impact threatened, endangered, or other special status species such as the bald eagle, peregrine falcon, and Pohl’s Milkvetch. Another commentor asked that the EIS evaluate potential impacts on wild horses.

One commentor suggested that rabbits and pigeons should be prevented from getting near the casks because of the potential for impacts from repeated low-level exposures; and one commentor was concerned about the potential for bioaccumulation of radionuclides in raptors from accidental contamination of their prey. The commentor stated that rodent and insect barriers may be needed for the casks. Some commentors felt that the impacts of the project may extend well beyond the boundaries of the site itself and that the EIS should evaluate potential impacts to natural resources throughout northern Utah.

2.2.9 Cultural Resources and Environmental Justice

Some commentors indicated that the proposed project may have adverse and unacceptable impacts on the historic and archaeological resources and heritage of the area. They felt that a full analysis of those potential impacts should be included in the EIS. Several commentors pointed to the cultural traditions and lifestyle of the resident Native Americans and were concerned that the proposed project might disrupt the practice and enjoyment of that lifestyle. These commentors felt

that Native American reservations have been disproportionately used as sites for hazardous and toxic waste storage or disposal. A few commentors noted that the proposed project has caused social rifts among Tribal members.

Citing Executive Order 12898, some commentors mentioned environmental justice issues and said that most of the impacts of the proposed project would fall on a minority population that already experiences increased environmental and health risks from several nearby hazardous facilities. Some commentors suggested that the presence of the proposed facility, the transport of nuclear fuel, and the potential for accidents may induce fears and a loss of the sense of well-being among residents, impinge on and diminish the value of ancestral or sacred land, and affect residents' attitude toward their community and lands. They indicated that these impacts may be felt both individually and collectively for the resident population. Other commentors were concerned that the economic benefits of the proposed project might not be distributed fairly among the resident Native Americans. Furthermore, the commentors suggested that emergency planning programs for transportation and operation should specifically consider the needs and characteristics of the Native American population.

2.2.10 Need for the Facility

The need for the facility was questioned by several commentors. For instance, it was felt that many nuclear power plants have the capability to store the spent fuel they generate and that an analysis of the need for the facility should therefore include current and projected quantities of spent fuel and storage capacity at those plants.

Commentors further suggested that the assessment of the need for the Skull Valley facility must consider that need on a national level, must be consistent with current national nuclear waste policy and legislation, and should not be used to divert national attention and policy away from more suitable locations. Some commentors also felt that the need for the facility is being evaluated only for temporary storage when it may become a permanent facility if no suitable repositories are available at the end of the facility's license.

2.2.11 Radiological Impacts and Human Health and Safety

The dominant human health and safety concern expressed by commentors was the potential for exposure to radiation. They noted that exposures to both workers and the public could occur during transport of nuclear fuel, after an accident, and during routine operations and maintenance; and they felt that comprehensive dose assessments should be conducted. The commentors also felt that the health effects of accidental releases would be very serious. Potential adverse effects on the mental health of residents and on people exposed to radiation in an accident were also mentioned; one commentor was concerned that the perception of risk could cause adverse impacts on a population. Other commentors said that the EIS should analyze health risks in the context of the ongoing risks from the nearby chemical and hazardous waste facilities—some commentors felt that many residents of the region have already experienced significant health problems because of those facilities and existing contamination in the area. Commentors also felt that the public health and safety resources of the State would be overburdened if they must be used to address the real and perceived risks of the facility. One commentor stated that quantitative and qualitative health and ecological risk assessments should be provided. Another commentor suggested that rain and melted snow may become radiologically contaminated on the concrete pads.

2.2.12 Emergency Preparedness

Several commentors noted that the inherent hazards of spent nuclear fuel and the potentially serious consequences of a catastrophic accident should make emergency preparedness issues a consideration in the EIS. They stated that a specific, detailed emergency response plan should be prepared; that it should be coordinated, reviewed, and approved by relevant local, State, and Federal organizations; that it should describe the on- and off-site emergency response capabilities; and that it should not be limited only to Skull Valley or Tooele County.

Some commentors indicated that emergency response planning should cover all transportation corridors and all elements of emergency preparedness such as facilities, equipment, infrastructure, response capabilities, monitoring, warning and notification systems, personnel training, cumulative impacts, mitigation, and relevant NWP provisions. Two commentors felt that the emergency planning for the proposed facility should be modeled after the U.S. Army's Chemical Stockpile Emergency Preparedness Program, particularly its emphasis on effective coordination, consultation, and agreement with State agencies. One commentor suggested that financial assistance may be needed in at-risk communities. Specific concerns mentioned by one commentor include (1) wildfires, (2) snow buildup around casks, (3) excessive heat and cold, (4) accident response times, and (5) impacts of being unable to repack a damaged cask.

2.2.13 Decommissioning

Some commentors felt that decommissioning of the proposed facility may be difficult and costly, particularly if any accidents occurred during the license term. These commentors expressed uncertainties about the ability and willingness of the applicant's member utilities to provide sufficient funds for decommissioning. They further stated that the financial viability and responsibilities of the member utilities may be difficult to assess and that individual member utilities may elect to withdraw from PFS, thereby complicating the question of funding for decommissioning.

2.2.14 Long-term Storage

Several commentors were concerned that the proposed project is being planned as an interim storage facility but may become a permanent storage facility. They cited, as an example, the current unavailability of the Yucca Mountain site, the uncertain schedule for opening that site, and the potential legal, regulatory, and social opposition that may arise if other sites are proposed. In general, these commentors felt that the proposed facility will be forced to store spent fuel past the license term or will become attractive as a permanent storage site if very few alternatives are available. Because of these concerns, the commentors stated that the analysis of environmental impacts in the EIS should include the possibility of long-term or even permanent storage of spent fuel in the proposed facility.

2.2.15 Alternatives

Some commentors said that the no-action alternative should be covered in detail, including the economic and environmental benefits of leaving spent fuel stored on-site at the originating nuclear power plants. One commentor mentioned that the evaluation of alternatives should include all the technological concerns raised by the State of Utah about the proposed facility. Another commentor felt that the potential environmental justice impacts of the proposed facility could possibly be

mitigated by the selection of an alternative site. Some commentors stated that other sites may be more suitable locations for spent fuel storage if a permanent repository is not available at the end of the proposed facility's license term. A few commentors suggested that other locations, including regional private ISFSIs, may be more suitable for a spent fuel storage facility. One commentor said that the applicant's Environmental Report lists 38 potential sites and that the EIS should evaluate each of these sites. The commentor also mentioned that alternative transportation routes should be evaluated in the EIS. Lastly, some commentors felt that the analysis of alternatives should acknowledge the possibility that other facilities may not be available to receive damaged canisters if PFS is required to ship such items off-site or when the license term expires.

2.3 OTHER SOURCES OF SCOPING-RELATED INFORMATION

The comments from the public scoping meeting, as well as the written comments received within the scoping period, were used to help NRC define the issues and alternatives to be addressed in the EIS. As part of determining the scope of the draft EIS, the NRC staff has also reviewed its regulations and generic guidance documents relevant to the preparation of the EIS, as well as many of the documents that were submitted as part of the licensing process for this facility, as appropriate. Some of these documents, although not summarized here, present issues and alternatives that helped to refine the scope of the EIS.

3. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

3.1 SCOPE OF THE EIS

To a large extent, the general content of an EIS prepared by NRC is prescribed by NEPA (Public Law 91-90, as amended), NRC's regulations for compliance with NEPA (10 CFR Part 51), and guidance provided by the Council on Environmental Quality regulations (40 CFR Parts 1500–08). These regulations broadly define the areas that must be considered in the assessment of potential impacts resulting from a proposed action. In conjunction with these regulatory guidelines, the scoping process summarized in this report helped to identify and refine the project-specific issues that warrant consideration in the EIS.

The EIS will include a cost/benefit analysis that summarizes the environmental and other costs and benefits of the proposed action. On the basis of the regulations and the scoping process, NRC has initially determined that the EIS will assess the potential environmental impacts of the proposed facility, for both construction and operation activities, in the following subject areas, as supplemented by the areas identified in Attachment B:

- ***Radiological impacts and human health and safety.*** The potential public health consequences of the proposed facility will be evaluated primarily in terms of radiological exposure risk during normal operations (including handling, transfer, and inspection activities) and under credible accident scenarios. Nonradiological events and activities with potential human health impacts will also be identified and evaluated.
- ***Cumulative impacts.*** The EIS will analyze the potential cumulative impacts, if any, of the proposed facility in the context of other existing and proposed facilities and activities in the area of the proposed site, as appropriate.
- ***Socioeconomics.*** The socioeconomic issues that fall within the scope of the EIS include the direct and indirect economic effects (both beneficial and adverse) on employment, taxes, property values, residential and commercial development, agriculture, and public services in the area. The EIS will include an economic cost/benefit analysis. The effects of the proposed project on land use in the area, including public lands and rights-of-way, will be assessed in the EIS, including an evaluation of the extent to which lands and land use may be disturbed or altered during construction and operation of the proposed facility. In addition, recreational and tourism sites, wilderness areas, and aesthetic values of the area will be analyzed.
- ***Cultural resources and environmental justice.*** The EIS will assess potential impacts of the proposed project on the historic and archaeological resources of the area and on the cultural traditions and lifestyle of Native Americans. Environmental justice impacts will receive attention because of the location of the proposed facility on Reservation lands.
- ***Geology and seismicity.*** The EIS will describe the geologic and seismic characteristics of the proposed site. Evaluation of the potential for earthquakes, ground motion, soil stability concerns, surface rupturing, and any other major geologic or seismic considerations that would affect the suitability of the proposed site as a storage location for SNF will be addressed in the SER rather than the EIS; the SER will also address cask design, particularly in the context of potential seismic events.
- ***Transportation.*** The analysis of potential impacts resulting from the transportation of spent fuel will consider relevant aspects of both rail and truck transport of SNF to the proposed facility.

The EIS will discuss the number, type, and frequency of shipments, as well as routing considerations and the quantities of spent fuel being shipped. The impacts of transportation will be evaluated primarily in terms of radiological exposure risk during normal transportation (including handling, transfer, and inspection) and under credible accident scenarios. The nonradiological impacts of transportation will also be identified and evaluated. Construction activities required for road or rail systems will be assessed, including input from BIA and BLM.

- **Accidents.** The SER will assess the environmental impacts associated with credible accidents at the proposed facility, both from natural events and human activities. (NRC regulations and guidance specify that the facility be designed to withstand various natural events without having a significant radiological release). The EIS will analyze the potential environmental impacts resulting from credible accidents at the proposed facility.
- **Compliance with applicable regulations.** The EIS will present a listing of the relevant permits and regulations that are believed to apply to the proposed facility. Regulatory or legal issues that will be covered in the EIS include water rights, land use restrictions such as rights-of-way, and oil, gas, or mineral leases that would interfere with the availability or suitability of the proposed site.
- **Air quality.** Potential air quality impacts of the proposed project will be evaluated in the EIS. The evaluation will include potential impacts resulting from construction activities and operation and will compare the anticipated air quality impacts, if any, with relevant standards. If appropriate, modeling will be performed to assist in the analysis of potential air quality impacts.
- **Hydrology.** The EIS will assess the potential impacts of the proposed project on surface water and groundwater resources. The assessment will consider water resources, water quality, water use, floodplains, and the probable maximum flood.
- **Ecological resources.** The EIS will assess the potential environmental impacts of the proposed facility on ecological resources, including plant and animal species and threatened or endangered species or critical habitat that may occur in the area. As appropriate, the assessment will include potential effects on wildlife migration patterns; and mitigation measures to address adverse impacts will be analyzed.
- **Need for the facility.** A discussion of the need for the proposed facility and the expected benefits will be presented in the EIS and will include an estimate of the amounts of spent fuel generated by participating nuclear power plants and the utilities' capabilities to store that fuel.
- **Decommissioning.** The EIS will include a general discussion of decommissioning of the facility and associated impacts.
- **Alternatives.** The no-action alternative and other reasonable alternatives to the proposed action will be described and assessed in the EIS. Other reasonable alternatives to the proposed action, such as alternative sites or alternative storage methods, will be considered.

3.2 ISSUES OUTSIDE THE SCOPE OF THE EIS

The purpose of an EIS is to assess the potential environmental impacts of a proposed action as part of the decision-making process of an agency—in this case, a licensing decision. As noted in Sect. 2.1, some issues and concerns raised during the scoping process are not relevant to the EIS because they are not directly related to the assessment of potential impacts or to the decision-making process. Exclusion from the EIS, however, does not suggest that an issue or concern lacks value. Issues beyond the scope of an EIS may be appropriately discussed and decided in other venues.

Some of the issues raised during the public scoping will not be addressed in the EIS. These include legal issues such as the potential conflict between Federal laws regarding Tribal sovereignty and State laws regarding waste storage. An analysis of DOE's statutory responsibilities regarding SNF, particularly as legislated in the Nuclear Waste Policy Act, is also outside the scope of the EIS; and DOE's responsibilities regarding SNF do not require that DOE be a cooperating agency for this EIS. Similarly, DOE's activities at Yucca Mountain and questions about the future availability of that site are beyond the scope of the EIS, as is the potential that such a facility may not become available within the next 40 years [see 10 CFR § 51.23(b)]. Other issues that will not be evaluated in the EIS include requests to extend the scoping period in response to revised licensing-related submittals by the applicant and conducting separate scoping processes for BIA and BLM.

Some issues raised during the public scoping process for the proposed facility are outside the scope of the EIS, but they will be analyzed in the SER. The EIS and the SER are related in that they may cover the same topics and may contain similar information, but the analysis in the EIS is limited to an assessment of potential environmental impacts. In contrast, the SER primarily deals with safety evaluations and procedural requirements or license conditions to ensure the health and safety of workers and the general public. The SER also covers other aspects of the proposed action such as demonstrating that the applicant will provide adequate funding for decommissioning of the facility (in compliance with NRC financial assurance regulations) and that the site-specific emergency preparedness procedures are appropriate. Also, the design of the transport, transfer, and storage casks will be evaluated in the SER or in separate rulemaking proceedings for conformity with NRC regulations regarding safety and testing. The SER will include an evaluation of the safeguards at the proposed facility (pursuant to 10 CFR Part 73).

Attachment A

**Comment Subject Areas by Commentor,
Oral and Written Comments**

Attachment A. Comment subject areas by commentor, oral and written comments^a

Commentor and affiliation (if any)	Safety and accidents	Transportation	Cumulative impacts and EIS scope	Regulatory compliance	Geology and seismicity	Hydrology	Socioeconomics	Ecology	Cultural res. & env. justice	Need for the facility	Radiological impacts and human health	Emergency preparedness	Decommissioning	Long-term storage	Alternatives
Oral comments															
Lee Allison, Utah Geological Survey	✓				✓										
Calvin Andrews, Analogics Marketing and Consulting	✓	✓	✓		✓		✓	✓	✓		✓			✓	
Wayne Ball, Utah Department of Health	✓	✓	✓				✓				✓				
Steven Barrowes, Scientists for Secure Waste Storage	✓	✓			✓	✓		✓			✓	✓			
Leon Bear, Chairman, Skull Valley Band of the Goshute Indians		✓	✓	✓			✓								
Ralph Becker, Utah House of Representatives	✓	✓	✓	✓							✓			✓	✓
Lisa Bullcreek, member, Skull Valley Goshutes	✓					✓	✓	✓	✓						
Margene Bullcreek, Ohngo Gaudadeh Devia Awareness	✓	✓	✓			✓	✓	✓	✓		✓				
Chris Cernich, Utah Dept. of Agriculture and Foods	✓						✓	✓			✓				

Attachment A (continued)

Commentor and affiliation (if any)	Safety and accidents	Transportation	Cumulative impacts and EIS scope	Regulatory compliance	Geology and seismicity	Hydrology	Socioeconomics	Ecology	Cultural res. & env. justice	Need for the facility	Radiological impacts and human health	Emergency preparedness	Decommissioning	Long-term storage	Alternatives
Kathleen Clark, Utah Department of Natural Resources	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓							
Donald Cobb, Utah Department of Public Safety	✓	✓										✓			
Merrill Cook, U.S. House of Representatives	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓							✓	✓
Cynthia of the Desert	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓			✓		✓	✓			✓
Nina Dougherty, Sierra Club, Utah Chapter	✓	✓	✓		✓		✓	✓	✓		✓				✓
Ferris Groll, Utah Department of Public Safety	✓	✓					✓								
R. J. Hoffman	✓		✓							✓	✓				✓
Steve Hoffman, Hawk Watch International		✓					✓	✓							
Rosemary Holt, Women Concerned/Utahns United	✓	✓	✓											✓	✓
Martin Huebner, Coalition 21			✓												

Attachment A (continued)

Commentor and affiliation (if any)	Safety and accidents	Transportation	Cumulative impacts and EIS scope	Regulatory compliance	Geology and seismicity	Hydrology	Socioeconomics	Ecology	Cultural res. & env. justice	Need for the facility	Radiological impacts and human health	Emergency preparedness	Decommissioning	Long-term storage	Alternatives
Jonathan Hurd, Salt Lake Food Not Bombs			✓				✓				✓				
Bob James, Hill Air Force Base	✓														
Virgil Johnson, member Goshute Tribe (Ibapah)	✓						✓		✓						
John Paul Kennedy, general counsel for the Confederated Tribes of the Goshute Reservation				✓			✓		✓		✓		✓		✓
Stephanie Kessler, Wyoming Outdoor Council	✓	✓	✓	✓			✓			✓		✓		✓	✓
Michael O. Leavitt, Governor, State of Utah	✓	✓	✓	✓			✓				✓			✓	✓
Brian Meacham, Utah Peace Test	✓	✓	✓		✓										✓
Dianne Nelson, Utah Department of Environmental Quality	✓	✓	✓	✓			✓		✓		✓	✓			✓
William D. Peterson, P&A Engineers	✓										✓				

Attachment A (continued)

Commentor and affiliation (if any)	Safety and accidents	Transportation	Cumulative impacts and EIS scope	Regulatory compliance	Geology and seismicity	Hydrology	Socioeconomics	Ecology	Cultural res. & env. justice	Need for the facility	Radiological impacts and human health	Emergency preparedness	Decommissioning	Long-term storage	Alternatives
Bonnie Robinson	✓	✓									✓				
Christopher Robinson, Skull Valley Co., Ltd.; Castle Rock Land & Livestock, L.C.; and Ensign Ranches of Utah, L.C.	✓	✓				✓	✓	✓			✓			✓	✓
Jerry Schmidt	✓	✓			✓		✓		✓		✓				
David Terry, School and Institutional Trust Lands Administration, State of Utah							✓								
Gregory Thayn, Bureau of Land Management, Utah State Office		✓	✓	✓				✓	✓						
Chip Ward, West Desert HEAL	✓	✓	✓				✓	✓			✓				
Suzanne Winters, Utah State Science Advisor	✓	✓		✓								✓			
Written comments															
Agency for Nuclear Projects, State of Nevada (Robert R. Loux)		✓													
Myron and Lois Armstrong			✓								✓				✓

Attachment A (continued)

Commentor and affiliation (if any)	Safety and accidents	Transportation	Cumulative impacts and EIS scope	Regulatory compliance	Geology and seismicity	Hydrology	Socioeconomics	Ecology	Cultural res. & env. justice	Need for the facility	Radiological impacts and human health	Emergency preparedness	Decommissioning	Long-term storage	Alternatives
Bureau of Land Management (U.S. Department of the Interior) Utah State Office (G. W. Lamb)	✓	✓	✓				✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	
Coalition 21 (M. F. Huebner)			✓												
Merrill Cook, U.S. Congress	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓									✓	✓
Department of the Air Force (E. Allan Dalpias)	✓						✓								
Downwinders, Inc. (S. Erickson)	✓		✓	✓	✓				✓		✓	✓			✓
Dolores K. Gurr	✓				✓						✓				
Land and Water Fund, for L. Bullcreek, M. Bulcreek & OGD (R. E. Condit and J. Walker)	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓
Michael O. Leavitt, Governor, State of Utah		✓	✓				✓							✓	✓
Nuclear Information and Resource Service (Mary Olson)	✓	✓	✓	✓			✓		✓		✓			✓	✓
P&A Engineers (William D. Peterson)	✓														

Attachment A (continued)

Commentor and affiliation (if any)	Safety and accidents	Transportation	Cumulative impacts and EIS scope	Regulatory compliance	Geology and seismicity	Hydrology	Socioeconomics	Ecology	Cultural res. & env. justice	Need for the facility	Radiological impacts and human health	Emergency preparedness	Decommissioning	Long-term storage	Alternatives
Parr Waddoups Brown Gee & Loveless, for Castle Rock (B. T. Allen)		✓	✓			✓	✓	✓							✓
Fae Picklesimer															✓
Public Citizen Critical Mass Energy Project, et al. (M. Olson, A. Piersma, D. Kraft, C. Williams, D. Katz)				✓						✓					
Donald J. Ravas	✓				✓						✓				
Sierra Club, Utah Chapter (C. King)	✓	✓			✓		✓		✓		✓				
Skull Valley Band of Goshute Indians (L. Bear)							✓		✓						
State of Utah, Department of Environmental Quality (D. R. Nielson)	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Doug Tanner								✓	✓						
Utah Farm Bureau Federation (C. B. Wallentine)	✓			✓		✓	✓	✓							

Attachment A (continued)

Commentor and affiliation (if any)	Safety and accidents	Transportation	Cumulative impacts and EIS scope	Regulatory compliance	Geology and seismicity	Hydrology	Socioeconomics	Ecology	Cultural res. & env. justice	Need for the facility	Radiological impacts and human health	Emergency preparedness	Decommissioning	Long-term storage	Alternatives
Utah Peace Test (B. Meacham)	✓	✓	✓		✓										✓
Carol Werner	✓				✓	✓	✓							✓	✓
West Desert HEAL et al. (C. Ward)	✓	✓	✓				✓	✓			✓				
Western Interstate Energy Board (K. Niles and A. Turner)		✓													
Delbert Williams		✓	✓												✓
Morrie Wills	✓		✓			✓	✓	✓	✓		✓		✓	✓	✓
Women Concerned/Utahns United (R. A. Holt)	✓	✓												✓	✓
N. Woodmansee	✓														✓
Wyoming Outdoor Council (S. Kessler)	✓	✓	✓	✓			✓			✓		✓		✓	✓

^aSome commentors gave oral and written comments and are therefore listed twice in the table.

Attachment B

Proposed Outline for the Draft Environmental Impact Statement

PROPOSED OUTLINE OF THE DRAFT EIS CONTENTS

PRIVATE FUEL STORAGE FACILITY, SKULL VALLEY INDIAN RESERVATION

1. PURPOSE AND NEED

- 1.1 INTRODUCTION**
- 1.2 THE PROPOSED PROJECT**
- 1.3 NEED FOR THE PROPOSED PROJECT**
- 1.4 SCOPING PROCESS**
- 1.5 COOPERATING AGENCIES**
- 1.6 STATUS OF FEDERAL AND STATE APPROVALS**

2. ALTERNATIVES INCLUDING THE PROPOSED ACTION

2.1 PROPOSED ACTION

- 2.1.1 Applicant's Site Selection Process**
 - 2.1.1.1 Candidate Site Identification and Screening**
 - 2.1.1.2 Selection of Proposed and Alternative Sites**
 - 2.1.1.3 Potential Sites on Skull Valley Indian Reservation**
- 2.1.2 Site Preparation and Construction**
 - 2.1.2.1 Site Development**
 - 2.1.2.2 Plant Design and Layout**
 - 2.1.2.3 Utilities and Other Services**
 - 2.1.2.4 Access Road, Fences, and Other Ancillary Facilities**
 - 2.1.2.5 Intermodal Transfer Point Facility**
 - 2.1.2.6 Improvements and Additions to Skull Valley Road**
 - 2.1.2.7 Rail Spur (or any Rail Spur options)**
 - 2.1.2.8 Resource Requirements and Waste Generation**
- 2.1.3 Operation**
 - 2.1.3.1 Transportation of Spent Fuel to PFSF**
 - 2.1.3.2 Receipt and Transfer of Spent Fuel at PFSF**
 - 2.1.3.3 Operation of the Storage System**
 - 2.1.3.4 Emissions, Effluents, and Solid Wastes**
- 2.1.4 Decommissioning**

2.2 NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE

2.3 ALTERNATIVE SITES FOR SPENT FUEL STORAGE

- 2.3.1 Site Selection Process Used by the Applicant**
- 2.3.2 Alternative Off-site Location**
- 2.3.3 Alternate Location on the Skull Valley Reservation**

2.4 ALTERNATIVE SPENT FUEL STORAGE TECHNOLOGIES

2.5 STAFF CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

3. AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT

- 3.1 GENERAL SITE DESCRIPTION**
- 3.2 ATMOSPHERIC RESOURCES**

- 3.2.1 Climate
 - 3.2.2 Air Quality
 - 3.3 GEOLOGY AND SOILS
 - 3.3.1 Regional Geology
 - 3.3.2 Local Geology
 - 3.3.3 Seismicity
 - 3.3.4 Soils
 - 3.4 WATER RESOURCES
 - 3.4.1 Surface Water Hydrology and Quality
 - 3.4.2 Groundwater Hydrology and Quality
 - 3.4.3 Water Use and Rights
 - 3.5 ECOLOGICAL RESOURCES
 - 3.5.1 Terrestrial Resources
 - 3.5.1.1 Vegetation
 - 3.5.1.2 Wildlife
 - 3.5.2 Aquatic Resources
 - 3.5.2.1 Perennial and Intermittent Streams
 - 3.5.2.2 Wetlands
 - 3.5.3 Threatened, Endangered, and Other Special Status Species
 - 3.6 SOCIOECONOMIC AND COMMUNITY RESOURCES
 - 3.6.1 Employment
 - 3.6.2 Population and Housing
 - 3.6.3 Community Services
 - 3.6.4 Demography
 - 3.6.5 Land Use
 - 3.6.6 Aesthetics
 - 3.7 CULTURAL AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESOURCES
 - 3.8 NOISE AND TRAFFIC
- 4. ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES
 - 4.1 SITE PREPARATION AND CONSTRUCTION IMPACTS
 - 4.1.1 Air Quality
 - 4.1.2 Groundwater and Surface Water
 - 4.1.3 Geology and Soils
 - 4.1.4 Ecological Resources
 - 4.1.5 Land Use
 - 4.1.6 Socioeconomic and Community Resources
 - 4.1.7 Environmental Justice
 - 4.1.8 Noise
 - 4.1.9 Traffic
 - 4.2 OPERATION IMPACTS
 - 4.2.1 Nonradiological Impacts
 - 4.2.1.1 Air Quality
 - 4.2.1.2 Groundwater and Surface Water Hydrology
 - 4.2.1.3 Geology and Soils
 - 4.2.1.4 Ecological Resources

- 4.2.1.5 Land Use
 - 4.2.1.6 Socioeconomic and Community Resources
 - 4.2.1.7 Environmental Justice
 - 4.2.1.8 Cultural and Archaeological Resources
 - 4.2.1.9 Noise
 - 4.2.1.10 Transportation
 - 4.2.2 Radiological Impacts
 - 4.2.2.1 Dose Evaluation Methods
 - 4.2.2.2 Dose Estimates for Routine Operations
 - 4.2.2.3 Transportation
 - 4.2.2.4 Accident Analysis
 - 4.2.3 Cumulative Environmental Impacts
 - 4.2.3.1 Air Quality
 - 4.2.3.2 Groundwater and Surface Water Hydrology
 - 4.2.3.3 Geology and Soils
 - 4.2.3.4 Ecological Resources
 - 4.2.3.5 Land Use
 - 4.2.3.6 Socioeconomic and Community Resources
 - 4.2.3.7 Environmental Justice
 - 4.2.3.8 Cultural and Archaeological Resources
 - 4.2.3.9 Noise
 - 4.2.3.10 Transportation
 - 4.2.4 Unavoidable Adverse Environmental Impacts
 - 4.2.5 Relationship Between Short-Term Uses and Long-Term Productivity
 - 4.2.6 Irreversible and Irretrievable Commitment of Resources
 - 4.3 DECOMMISSIONING
 - 4.4 NO-ACTION ALTERNATIVE
 - 4.5 ALTERNATIVE SITES
 - 4.6 ALTERNATIVE SPENT FUEL STORAGE TECHNOLOGIES
5. COST/BENEFIT ANALYSIS
- 5.1 ECONOMIC COSTS OF CONSTRUCTING AND OPERATING THE PROPOSED PROJECT
 - 5.2 COST/BENEFIT OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT AND ALTERNATIVES
 - 5.3 COST/BENEFIT SUMMARY
 - 5.4 STAFF ASSESSMENT
6. ENVIRONMENTAL MONITORING PROGRAMS
- 6.1 PREOPERATIONAL MONITORING
 - 6.2 OPERATIONAL MONITORING
7. FEDERAL AND STATE ENVIRONMENTAL REQUIREMENTS
8. AGENCIES CONSULTED

9. LIST OF PREPARERS

10. REFERENCES

INDEX

APPENDICES (e.g., Comments on DEIS and Responses to Comments, Consultation Letters)



UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20555-0001

November 8, 1999

Dear Addressee:

On April 29, 1999, the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC), U.S. Bureau of Land Management (BLM), and U.S. Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) held public scoping meetings in Salt Lake City, and Tooele, Utah, on certain aspects of the environmental impact statement (EIS) for the independent spent fuel storage installation facility (ISFSI) proposed by Private Fuel Storage, L.L.C. A number of interested parties attended the scoping meetings and provided comments. In addition to comments received at the meetings, interested parties also provided written comments to the NRC, BLM, and BIA. The enclosed Scoping Report summarizes the comments received and supplements the NRC's September 1998 scoping report, which summarizes comments received during the 1998 scoping process for the proposed ISFSI. This Supplemental Scoping Report was coordinated with BLM and BIA.

The public scoping process is a valuable and fundamentally important part in the preparation of any EIS. The participation provided during the scoping process for this proposed project is appreciated and will assist the NRC, BLM, and BIA in the preparation of the EIS. This Supplemental Scoping Report is being provided to all individuals who attended one of the April 29, 1999, meetings and provided a mailing address. The 1998 Scoping Report and the enclosed Supplemental Scoping Report are both available for public inspection at the NRC's Public Document Room in the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW Washington, DC 20555. The Supplemental Scoping Report can also be obtained from the BLM's field office (2370 South 2300 West, Salt Lake City, Utah 84119) and BIA's offices (988 South 7500 East, Fort Duchesne, Utah 84026 or 400 North 5th Street, Phoenix, Arizona 85004).

Sincerely,

E. William Brach, Director
Spent Fuel Project Office
Office of Nuclear Material Safety
and Safeguards

Docket No. 72-22

Enclosure: Supplemental Scoping Report

cc w/encl: Service lists
Meeting attendees

Environmental Impact Statement Scoping Process

Supplemental Scoping Report

Private Fuel Storage Facility

Skull Valley Indian Reservation, Tooele County, Utah

November 1999



U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC

DOCKET 72-22

Environmental Impact Statement Scoping Process

Supplemental Scoping Report

Private Fuel Storage Facility

Skull Valley Indian Reservation, Tooele County, Utah

November 1999



U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC

1. INTRODUCTION

Private Fuel Storage L.L.C. (PFS), a company owned by eight U.S. electric utilities,¹ has applied to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC or Commission) for a license to construct and operate an independent spent fuel storage installation (ISFSI). Pursuant to the Atomic Energy Act, as amended, and the Commission's regulations in Title 10 of the *Code of Federal Regulations*, PFS filed an application (Docket No. 72-22) with an accompanying Environmental Report on June 20, 1997, for a specific license to receive, transfer, and possess nuclear power reactor spent fuel and other radioactive material associated with spent nuclear fuel (SNF) storage in an ISFSI. The application proposed to construct and operate the ISFSI on land leased from the Skull Valley Band of Goshute Indians. The proposed facility would be located on an 820-acre site in the northwest corner of the Skull Valley Band of Goshute Indian Reservation. The reservation is located within the geographic boundaries of Tooele County, Utah, approximately 27 miles west-southwest of the city of Tooele. The proposed facility would store up to 40,000 metric tons of uranium (MTU) in a maximum of 4,000 casks. The application also proposed that SNF would be transported from the reactor sites via rail to an Intermodal Transfer Point (ITP), located at Timpie, Utah. From the ITP, the fuel would be transported to the site via Skull Valley Road (using a heavy haul vehicle) or via a proposed rail line that would run parallel to Skull Valley Road. By letter dated August 28, 1998, PFS submitted an amendment to its application. The amendment proposed to (1) move the ITP approximately 1.8 miles West of Timpie, and (2) construct a rail line along the base of the Cedar mountains from the Low Junction (Skunk Ridge) to the ISFSI site in lieu of the rail line parallel to Skull Valley Road. This proposed rail route would traverse land managed by the Bureau of Land Management (BLM).

Pursuant to its regulations in 10 CFR Part 51, the NRC is preparing an environmental impact statement (EIS) on the proposed facility as part of its decision-making process. In addition to the EIS, the NRC is preparing a Safety Evaluation Report (SER) to address safety aspects of the proposed facility.

Both the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) and BLM are cooperating agencies in the preparation of the EIS. As trustees for the Skull Valley Band of the Goshute Indians, BIA has responsibility to ensure that the interests of the tribe are not compromised by construction and operation of the proposed ISFSI. Therefore, BIA must approve any lease agreement between the PFS and the Skull Valley Band of Goshute Indians. To date, BIA has conditionally approved the lease between PFS and the Skull Valley Band of Goshute Indians, contingent upon the completion of an EIS, inclusion of mitigation measures identified in the BIA's Record of Decision, and the issuance of an NRC license. As manager of the Federal land over which rail access to the site is being proposed, BLM must issue a right-of-way to PFS for the construction and use of the proposed rail line. The

¹As per p. 1-10 of the PFS License Application, the members of the limited liability company are: Genoa FuelTech, Inc., Indiana Michigan Power, Consolidated Edison Company of New York, GPU Nuclear Corporation, Northern States Power Company, Illinois Power Company, Southern Nuclear Operating Company, and Southern California Edison.

Resource Management Plan (RMP)² for the Federal land in question does not allow major rights-of-way, such as a rail line, outside of designated corridors. As the proposed rail line location is outside a designated corridor, BLM must amend the RMP prior to or concurrent with the issuance of a right-of-way for the proposed rail line.

The proposed facility would store SNF inside sealed canisters, which are enclosed in steel and concrete casks that provide shielding and additional mechanical protection to the fuel. The canister/cask-based system confines radioactive wastes and would be licensed by NRC in accordance with 10 CFR Part 72 requirements for storage of SNF. The proposed facility would be designed to store SNF for an initial license period of 20 years that would be subject to renewal for an additional 20 years. The applicant anticipates that by the end of the 40-year period all SNF stored at the proposed facility would have been transferred offsite, and the ISFSI site would be decommissioned. PFS anticipates receiving a license by 2002 in order to commence operation. Ownership and ultimate responsibility for the SNF would continue to remain with the utilities that generated it until such time as the fuel is transferred to the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE).

The scoping process was initiated on May 1, 1998, with the publication in the *Federal Register* of a Notice of Intent (NOI) to prepare an EIS and conduct the scoping process (63 *Fed. Reg.* 24197–98). As described in the NOI, the objectives of the scoping process are to:

1. define the scope of the proposed action which is to be the subject of the EIS;
2. determine the scope of the EIS and identify significant issues to be analyzed in depth;
3. identify and eliminate from detailed study issues which are peripheral or are not significant;
4. identify any environmental assessments and other EISs which are being or will be prepared that are related to but not part of the scope of the EIS under consideration;
5. identify other environmental review and consultation requirements related to the proposed action;
6. indicate the relationship between the timing of the environmental analyses and the Commission's tentative planning and decision-making schedule;
7. identify any cooperating agencies and, as appropriate, allocate assignments for preparation and schedules for completion of the EIS to the NRC and any cooperating agencies; and
8. describe the means by which the EIS will be prepared, including any contractor assistance to be used.

As a part of the scoping process, a public scoping meeting was held on June 2, 1998, in Salt Lake City, Utah. Several interested parties attended the meeting and provided comments. In addition to the comments received at the meeting, written comments were also provided to the NRC. In September 1998, the NRC issued a scoping report which summarized the determinations and conclusions reached in the initial scoping process. The initial scoping process was based on the description of the ISFSI contained in the June 20, 1997, application, which did not include the changes made to the proposed facility as a result of the August 28, 1998, amendment. Similarly, BIA's contingent approval of the lease was issued prior to the PFS amendment. The NRC, BLM, and BIA determined that the revision to the transportation proposal contained in the PFS amendment warranted supplementing the scoping process. Two additional public scoping meetings were held on

²The rail line would traverse land within the Pony Express Resource Management Plan.

April 29, 1999, one in Salt Lake City, Utah, and a second in Tooele, Utah. The focus of the meetings was limited to environmental issues related to the proposed rail line, the request for issuance of a right-of-way over public lands managed by BLM, and any environmental concerns associated with the proposed lease agreement that may not have been addressed in the NRC's initial scoping process. In addition to the comments received at the public meetings, written comments related to the proposed rail line and the lease agreement were also accepted until May 28, 1999. This report summarizes the oral and written comments received as a result of the most recent scoping activities. Individuals and organizations who provided comments during the scoping period will receive a copy of this report and subsequent documents such as the Draft and Final EIS. This report supplements the September 1998 scoping report. The NRC staff is currently preparing a draft EIS. Oak Ridge National Laboratory is the contractor selected by NRC to provide technical assistance in the preparation of the EIS. The environmental comments received as a result of the scoping process will be duly considered in the preparation of the draft EIS.

After publication of the draft EIS (anticipated to be Spring 2000), the public will be invited to comment on that document. After evaluating comments on the draft EIS, NRC will issue a final EIS that will serve as the basis for the Commission's consideration of environmental impacts in its decision on licensing the proposed ISFSI and for issuance of decisions by the cooperating agencies with authorizing actions. Section 2 of this report summarizes the comments and concerns expressed by government officials, agencies, and the public associated with the applicant's proposed August 28, 1998, amendment and any environmental concerns associated with the proposed lease agreement that may not have been addressed in the NRC's initial scoping process. Section 3 identifies the issues the EIS will address and those issues that are not within the scope of the EIS. Where appropriate, Section 3 identifies other places in the decision-making process where issues that are outside the scope of the EIS may be considered.

2. SUMMARY OF ISSUES RAISED DURING THE SCOPING PROCESS

2.1 OVERVIEW

On April 29, 1999, NRC held public scoping meetings in Salt Lake City, and Tooele, Utah on certain aspects of the EIS for the proposed ISFSI in Skull Valley, Utah. Specifically, the scoping meetings focused on the environmental issues of the proposed rail line, the request for issuance of a right-of-way over public lands managed by BLM, and any environmental concerns associated with the proposed lease agreement that may not have been addressed in the NRC's initial scoping process. During the scoping meetings, 20 individuals offered comments about the proposed action. Of these 20 speakers, 1 represented a member of the U.S. Congress, 1 represented a sovereign Indian tribe, 5 were representing State of Utah agencies or departments, and 13 spoke on behalf of other organizations or as private citizens. In addition, 9 written statements from individuals, organizations, and agencies were received during the scoping period. Some of these submittals were written statements or summaries of the verbal testimony. This active participation by the public in the scoping process is an important component of determining the major issues that the EIS should assess.

Individuals providing oral and written comments addressed several subject areas. The comments received were categorized into the following general topics:

- safety and accidents;
- transportation impacts;
- cumulative impacts and scope of the analysis;
- compliance with Federal, State, and local permits (including amending the BLM Pony Express Resource Management Plan);
- geology, soils and seismicity;
- hydrology (surface water and groundwater);
- socioeconomics (including land use, aesthetics, recreational resources, and cost-benefit analyses);
- ecology;
- cultural resources;
- need for the facility;
- emergency preparedness;
- decommissioning and long-term storage; and
- alternatives.

Some of the comments received addressed issues that were discussed during the previous scoping process, and two commentors re-submitted written comments provided during the previous scoping period. The September 1998 scoping report summarizes these comments and, therefore, will not be discussed in detail in this report. In addition, some commentors offered opinions and concerns that typically would not be included in the subject matter of an EIS, for example, general opinions about nuclear energy policy in the United States or issues that are more appropriately considered in the NRC's SER. Comments of this type are taken into consideration by the NRC, BLM, and BIA, but because they do not point to significant environmental issues to be analyzed, they will not be

discussed in detail in this report. Other statements may be relevant to the proposed action, but they have no direct bearing on the evaluation of alternatives or on the decision-making process involving the proposed action. For instance, general statements of support for or opposition to the proposed project fall into this category. Again, comments of this type have been noted but are not used in defining the scope and content of the EIS.

Attachment A to this report lists the commentors and, on the basis of the topics listed above, shows the subject areas covered by their comments.³ Note that Attachment A lists all comments received (i.e., within or outside of the scope of this scoping report) during the most recent comment period. Attachment B contains a proposed outline for the draft EIS, which considers the oral and written scoping comments received during the most recent scoping activities as well as the previous scoping process.

Section 2.2 summarizes the comments received during the most recent scoping process. Comments that were similar in nature to those received during the previous scoping process are not discussed in detail. Many of the issues raised have a direct bearing on the analysis of potential environmental impacts and the NRC's related decision-making process. Section 2.3 briefly describes other sources of project-related information that were considered during the scoping process for the EIS.

2.2 SUMMARY OF ISSUES RAISED

2.2.1 Safety and Accidents

The comments received in this area did not identify any new or different issues beyond those discussed during the previous scoping process.

2.2.2 Transportation Impacts

Several commentors expressed concern about the potential for accidents and sabotage during the transport of the spent nuclear fuel. Most of the comments echoed those presented during the first scoping process, however, a few commentors did introduce new concerns. One commentor suggested that the EIS consider the cumulative impacts of transportation resulting from the proposed facility, similar to the analysis completed by the NRC in NUREG-1437, Volume 1, Addendum 1, "Generic Environmental Impact Statement for License Renewal of Nuclear Plant." The commentor also suggested that the EIS evaluate design and operation details of the proposed rail line, and identify the necessary State of Utah permits and requirements for the construction and operation of the proposed rail line. One commentor suggested that the EIS consider specific sabotage scenarios. Another commentor suggested that the increasing traffic density on rail lines resulting from increasing consolidation and abandonment of rail lines, due to mergers, will directly affect the throughput of proposed spent fuel rail shipments. The commentor then suggested that the increase in traffic density increases the statistical probability and severity of potential accidents.

³ Two individuals re-submitted written comments that were originally provided during the 1998 scoping process. These comments are not reflected in Attachment 1.

2.2.3 Cumulative Impacts and Scope of the Analysis

Two commentors indicated that the EIS cumulative impacts analysis should be comprehensive and include the impacts of construction and operation of the proposed rail line. One commentor noted that the proposed rail line is being constructed solely to move spent fuel casks from the Union Pacific mainline to the Skull Valley Reservation, and the impacts should be considered in the EIS. One commentor suggested that if the intent is to expand the proposed rail line to Dugway, then the EIS address the impacts of doing so in this EIS .

2.2.4 Compliance with Applicable Local, State, and Federal Regulations

Some commentors indicated that State permits are required for the construction and operation of the proposed rail line and the ITP. One commentor indicated that permission must be obtained from the Utah Department of Transportation and Utah Department of Environmental Quality regarding a number of design, construction, and operational requirements for the proposed transportation methods where vehicles exceed size and weight restrictions. Another commentor stated that by State statute, the Utah Department of Transportation has the responsibility to approve the establishment of any new rail crossings of public roads as well as any work on existing crossings. Comments were also received that noted BLM is required to coordinate its proposed actions with the State to determine whether the proposed actions are consistent with State purposes, plans, policies, and programs.

Several commentors expressed concern about the proposed amendment to the BLM Pony Express RMP. One commentor suggested that because the RMP never contemplated the establishment of a rail line, the entire RMP should be reopened. Another commentor indicated that in amending the RMP, BLM is required to conform to the same National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) EIS planning process, and therefore, should consider alternatives, including a no action alternative. Other comentors suggested that the BLM should consider the economic impact to trust lands as a result of amending the RMP to allow a rail line, and that the RMP EIS review not be limited to the rail line, but consider all of the changes occurring in the RMP area.

2.2.5 Geology and Soils

Commentors expressed concern about the geological conditions in the western portion of Skull Valley and the potential impacts that could result from construction and operation of the rail line. One commentor noted that the proposed rail line route would cross two capable faults and a third fault that may be capable. The commentor suggested that the EIS consider the impacts of greater than expected ground shaking and the possibility of a surface rupturing earthquake along the rail route. The commentor also identified other geological hazards along the proposed rail route such as expansive and collapsible soils and debris flows and floods.

Another commentor suggested that the EIS carefully consider the impacts of constructing the proposed rail line, including mitigation measures, because the soils in the area could be contaminated with radiological and chemical materials. One commentor listed several minerals thought to exist near the proposed rail line route. The commentor

suggested that the construction and operation of a rail line in the area could negatively affect the ability to open pit mine for the resources and that the EIS should consider the economic loss to the State and to the Skull Valley Band.

2.2.6 Hydrology (Surface Water and Groundwater)

Commentors felt that the effects of construction and operation of the proposed project on surface water and groundwater resources should be assessed in detail for the proposed rail line and ITP. One commentor noted that during periods of intense rainfall and rapid snow melt, stream floods emanate from the mouth of the canyon. The commentor went on to suggest that these floods could potentially pose a hazard to the operation of the rail line. Other commentors suggested that the EIS discuss the water needs, including water requirements to fight fire, for the operation of the rail line and the ITP; the EIS identify the water rights and methods for obtaining those rights; and the EIS address the flood potential and method of managing floods from the greater watershed along the proposed rail line and at the ITP.

2.2.7 Socioeconomics

Commentors expressed concern about the impacts the proposed rail line could have on land use and value. Other commentors raised other socioeconomic issues such as the potential for increased rail line congestion and cost-benefit analysis issues.

Commentors were concerned about the effect of the proposed rail line on land values in the area, particularly public lands such as State-administered Trust lands and lands owned by other Indian tribes. One commentor stated that the effect of public apprehension on the market value and revenue potential for Trust lands near the proposed rail line are of concern and should be discussed in the EIS. Another commentor indicated that approval and use of BLM land for a rail line could result in a decline in property value and ultimately impact the economy of other nearby Indian Tribes.

Others indicated that the proposed project may alter the land use patterns of the area and set an undesirable precedent for future land use. Specifically, commentors noted that the rail line is due to cross land identified by the Southern Utah Wilderness Alliance as an area possessing wilderness character, and that impacts, such as noise and aesthetics, on wilderness and recreational areas from construction and operation of the rail line must be quantified. Comments from various individuals suggested that the presence of the rail line would disrupt recreational activities such as off-road vehicle use and hunting; that the storage and transportation of SNF in Skull Valley could impact the vitality and mission of the Utah Test and Training Range, operated by Hill Air Force Base, and such an impact should be considered because Hill Air Force Base is a major part of the State economy; and that the rail line could have adverse impacts on livestock grazing and animal movement.

One commentor indicated that the cost-benefit analysis must thoroughly evaluate and include the indirect and direct cost of the proposed rail line, including the cost associated with the potential impact to historic trails near the proposed rail line. It was also suggested that the EIS reflect all the social costs and benefits from granting the rights-of-way to build the rail line and the ITP. One commentor suggested that the EIS consider the economic loss if the proposed rail line route prevented the mining of minerals thought to be in the area.

2.2.8 Ecology

Commentors expressed several concerns about the impacts of the construction and operation of the proposed rail line on plant and animal species of the region. One commentor suggested that the proposed rail line should not be allowed to disturb these areas that have already been designated as important wildlife habitat, and that BLM should ensure that the rail line and transportation of SNF are consistent with each of the specific Habitat Management Plans, or the BLM should amend the Pony Express RMP, Wildlife and Fisheries Decision.

One commentor indicated that endangered, threatened, and candidate plant and animal species could potentially exist in the Low Corridor. The commentor also suggested that these species, other species, and their food base may be impacted by the construction and operation of the rail line. Another commentor noted that the rail line may disrupt other established wildlife migration patterns for mule deer and pronghorn antelope, and that noise levels from the construction and operation of the rail line may also disrupt mating and breeding activities. The commentor also noted that the RMP proposed to fully cooperate with the reintroduction of the Peregrine Falcon into the Timpie Springs area and that surface disturbing activities on public lands adjacent to these areas would not be permitted to disturb birds or destroy important habitat.

Several commentors noted that wild horses frequent the area where the rail line is being proposed, and one commentor suggested that the rail line would probably cut off the winter feeding range for the wild horses. Other comments received suggested that impacts due to increased mortality from collision with the rail cars be considered in the EIS; that preserving the foothills is necessary because some animal habitats exist at different elevations or some animals need to travel from one elevation to another; and that the operation of the rail line could potentially introduce unwanted species and result in an impact to the area. In addition, one commentor stated that deer near the rail line are hunted and used for food by some members of the Skull Valley Band. The commentor expressed concern that the construction and operation of the rail line may impact this activity.

Commentors also expressed concern about the impact to vegetation in the area. One commentor noted that the hundreds of acres of vegetation that will be disturbed during the construction of the proposed rail line provides habitat for a variety of wildlife species. Several commentors expressed concern about the impact of fire on vegetation near the rail line. One commentor suggested that sparks from the rail line may result in fires that could result in the loss of native vegetation that would then be replaced by less desirable seed grasses. Another commentor noted that the rail line would introduce a new fire source to an area that already has a high incident of wildfires. The commentor went on to suggest that the rail line and the transport of SNF could potentially hinder the ability to fight wildfires and result in increased damage.

2.2.9 Cultural Resources

Several commentors indicated that the proposed rail line may have adverse and unacceptable impacts to historic and archaeological resources in the area. They felt that a full analysis of those potential impacts should be included in the EIS. Some commentors noted that the proposed rail line route could possibly cross two historic trails, the Hasting Trail and the Donner-Reed Trail. One commentor expressed concern about access to the

historic trails if the proposed rail line is constructed and also expressed concerns about possible damage to existing ruts and swells in the valley. Other commentors noted that archeological artifacts have been encountered along the proposed rail line route. Another commentor suggested that more artifacts are likely to be found in the vicinity of the proposed rail line. Some commentors noted that the proposed rail line would traverse traditional ancestral lands which are of importance to some members of the Skull Valley Band and other nearby Indian Tribes, and the impacts of this should be considered in the EIS.

2.2.10 Need for the Facility

Comments received in this area did not provide any new or different information than that discussed during the previous scoping process.

2.2.11 Emergency Preparedness

Comments received in this area did not present any new or different issues beyond those discussed during the previous scoping process.

2.2.12 Decommissioning and Long-term Storage

Comments in this area mainly included issues that were addressed in the previous scoping process; however, one commentor did suggest the costs of decommissioning the site, especially after accidents, be compared to the benefits of the lease.

2.2.13 Alternatives

Comments in this area mainly included issues that were addressed in the previous scoping process; however, one commentor did suggest an alternative that was not addressed in the previous process. The commentor suggested that the EIS consider an alternative presented by the Secretary of Energy during congressional testimony on the proposed legislation, H.R. 45, Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1999. The alternative presented by the Secretary would have SNF remain at the reactor sites and the U.S. Department of Energy take ownership of the spent fuel. One commentor emphasized the need for the EIS to consider alternatives to the proposed rail line and ITP. The commentor suggested that the at least three alternatives be considered: granting either the rail line right-of-way or the ITP right-of-way, granting both rights-of-way, or some other hybrid.

2.3 OTHER SOURCES OF SCOPING-RELATED INFORMATION

Comments from the previous scoping process, the April 29, 1999, public scoping meetings, and the written comments received within the most recent scoping period, are being used to assist NRC, BLM, and BIA in defining the issues and alternatives to be addressed in the EIS. As part of determining the scope of the draft EIS, NRC staff has also

reviewed its regulations and generic guidance documents relevant to the preparation of the EIS, as well as many of the documents that were submitted as part of the licensing process for this facility, as appropriate. Some of these documents, although not summarized here, present issues and alternatives that helped to refine the scope of the EIS.

3. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

3.1 SCOPE OF THE EIS

In the September 1998 scoping report, NRC provided an overview of the scope of the EIS. Following the April 29, 1999, scoping meeting and the public comments received, NRC revisited the scope of the EIS to determine if it needed to be modified. The scope of the EIS described in this section reflects consideration of all the scoping comments received to date on the proposed project. As stated in the previous scoping report, the general content of an EIS prepared by NRC, for the most part, is prescribed by NEPA (Public Law 91-90, as amended), NRC's regulations for compliance with NEPA (10 CFR Part 51), and guidance provided by the Council on Environmental Quality regulations (40 CFR Parts 1500–1508), as well as NRC, BIA, and BLM NEPA guidelines. These regulations broadly define the areas that must be considered in the assessment of potential impacts resulting from a proposed action. In conjunction with these regulatory guidelines, the scoping process summarized in this report helped to identify and refine the project-specific issues that warrant consideration in the EIS.

The EIS will include a cost-benefit analysis that summarizes the environmental and other costs and benefits of the proposed action. On the basis of the regulations and the scoping process, NRC has initially determined that the EIS will assess the potential environmental impacts of the proposed project, for both construction and operation activities, in the following subject areas, as supplemented by the areas identified in Attachment B:

- **Radiological impacts and human health and safety.** The potential public health consequences of the proposed action will be evaluated primarily in terms of radiological exposure risk during normal operations, including transport of the SNF (including handling, transfer, and inspection activities) and under credible accident scenarios. Nonradiological events and activities with potential human health impacts will also be identified and evaluated.
- **Cumulative impacts.** The EIS will analyze the potential cumulative impacts, if any, of the proposed facility in the context of other existing and proposed facilities and activities in the area of the proposed project area, which includes the site, ITP, and rail line, as appropriate.
- **Socioeconomics.** The socioeconomic issues that fall within the scope of the EIS include the direct and indirect economic effects (both beneficial and adverse) on employment, taxes, residential and commercial development, agriculture, and public services in the area. The EIS will include an economic cost-benefit analysis. The effects of the proposed project on land use in the area, including use of public lands, tribal trust lands, and rights-of-way, will be assessed in the EIS. The EIS will also include an evaluation of the extent to which lands and land use may be disturbed or altered during construction and operation of all portions of the proposed action. In addition recreational and tourism sites, wilderness areas, and aesthetic values of the area will be analyzed.
- **Cultural resources and environmental justice.** The EIS will assess potential impacts of the proposed project on the historic and archaeological resources of the area and on the cultural traditions and lifestyle of Native Americans. An environmental justice review

will be included in the EIS. The EIS will also discuss the status of the consultation on historic properties required by the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended.

- **Geology and seismicity.** The EIS will describe the geologic and seismic characteristics of the proposed site and evaluate the impacts of construction and operation of the proposed project on the geology and soils. Evaluation of the potential for earthquakes, ground motion, soil stability concerns, surface rupturing, and any other major geologic or seismic considerations that would affect the suitability of the proposed site as a storage location for SNF will be addressed in the SER rather than the EIS; the SER will also address cask design, particularly in the context of potential seismic events.
- **Transportation.** The analysis of potential impacts resulting from the transportation of SNF will consider relevant aspects of both rail and truck transport to the proposed facility. The EIS will discuss the number, type, and frequency of shipments, as well as routing considerations and the quantities of SNF being shipped. The impacts of transportation will be evaluated primarily in terms of radiological exposure risk during normal transportation (including handling, transfer, and inspection) and under credible accident scenarios. The non-radiological impacts of transportation will also be identified and evaluated. Construction activities required for road or rail systems will be assessed, including input from BIA and BLM.
- **Accidents.** NRC safety regulations and guidance specify that the facility be designed to withstand various credible accidents, including natural events, without having a significant radiological release. The SER will include an evaluation and determination on the adequacy of the design to withstand credible accidents at the proposed facility, determine if any radiological release will occur as a result of the accident, and determine the significance of the radiological release. The EIS will analyze the potential environmental impacts resulting from credible accidents at the proposed facility.
- **Compliance with applicable regulations.** The EIS will present a listing of the relevant permits and regulations that are believed to apply to the proposed facility. Regulatory or legal issues that will be covered in the EIS include water rights, land use restrictions such as rights-of-way, and oil, gas, or mineral leases that would interfere with the availability or suitability of the proposed site.
- **Air quality.** Potential air quality impacts of the proposed project will be evaluated in the EIS. The evaluation will include potential impacts resulting from construction activities and operation and will compare the anticipated air quality impacts, if any, with relevant standards. If appropriate, modeling will be performed to assist in the analysis of potential air quality impacts.
- **Hydrology.** The EIS will assess the potential impacts of the proposed project on surface water and groundwater resources. The assessment will consider water resources, water quality, water use, floodplains, and the probable maximum flood.
- **Ecological resources.** The EIS will assess the potential environmental impacts of the proposed action on ecological resources, including plant and animal species and threatened or endangered species or critical habitat that may occur in the area. As appropriate, the assessment will include potential effects on wildlife migration patterns; and mitigation measures to address adverse impacts will be analyzed. The EIS will also discuss the status of any consultation required by the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended.

- ***Need for the facility.*** A discussion of the need for the proposed facility and the expected benefits will be presented in the EIS and will include an estimate of the amounts of SNF generated by participating nuclear power plants and the utilities' capabilities to store that fuel.
- ***Decommissioning.*** The EIS will include a general discussion of decommissioning of the facility and associated impacts.
- ***Alternatives.*** The no-action alternative and other reasonable alternatives to the proposed action will be described and assessed in the EIS. Other reasonable alternatives to the proposed action, such as alternative sites or alternative storage methods, will be considered.

3.2 ISSUES OUTSIDE THE SCOPE OF THE EIS

The purpose of an EIS is to assess the potential environmental impacts of a proposed action as part of the decision-making process of an agency—in this case, for three agencies, NRC (a licensing decision), BIA (lease approval decision), and BLM (granting a right-of-way). It should be noted that each agency's final decision (i.e., completion of its Federal actions) will not be made until after the Final EIS is issued. Some issues and concerns raised during both scoping processes (June 1998 and April 1999) are not relevant to the EIS because they are not directly related to the assessment of potential impacts or to the decision-making process. Exclusion from the EIS, however, does not suggest that an issue or concern lacks value. Issues beyond the scope of an EIS may be appropriately discussed and decided in other venues, such as the NRC safety review or the BIA lease approval review.

Some of the issues raised during the public scoping will not be addressed in the EIS. These include legal issues such as the potential conflict between Federal laws regarding Tribal sovereignty and State laws regarding waste storage. An analysis of DOE's statutory responsibilities regarding SNF, particularly as legislated in the Nuclear Waste Policy Act, is also outside the scope of the EIS; and DOE's responsibilities regarding SNF do not require that DOE be a cooperating agency for this EIS. Similarly, DOE's activities at Yucca Mountain and questions about the future availability of that site are beyond the scope of the EIS, as is the potential that such a facility may not become available within the next 40 years [see 10 CFR 51.23(b)]. Issues related to DOE's responsibilities for commercial nuclear reactor SNF are addressed in DOE's "Draft Environmental Impact Statement for a Geological Repository for the Disposal of Spent Nuclear Fuel and High Level Radioactive Waste at Yucca Mountain, Nye County, Nevada," DOE/EIS-0250D, July 1999.

Some issues raised during the public scoping process for the proposed facility are outside the scope of the EIS, but they will be analyzed in the SER. The EIS and the SER are related in that they may cover the same topics and may contain similar information, but the analysis in the EIS is limited to an assessment of potential environmental impacts. In contrast, the SER primarily deals with safety evaluations and procedural requirements or license conditions to ensure the health and safety of workers and the general public. The SER also covers other aspects of the proposed action such as demonstrating that the applicant will provide adequate funding for decommissioning of the facility (in compliance with NRC financial assurance regulations) and that the site-specific emergency preparedness procedures are appropriate. Also, the design of the transport, transfer, and storage casks will be evaluated in the SER or in separate rulemaking proceedings for conformity with NRC regulations regarding safety and testing. The SER will include an evaluation of the safeguards at the proposed facility (pursuant to 10 CFR Part 73).

Attachment A

Comment Subject Areas by Commentor Oral and Written Comments

Commentor and affiliation (if any)	Transportation Impacts	Safety and Accidents	Cumulative Impacts	Emergency	Ecology	Cultural Resources	Socioeconomics	Alternatives	Need for the Facility	Geology & Soils	Hydrology	Decommissioning	Fed., State, & Local Permits
Oral Comments													
Lee Allison, Utah Geological Survey						✓				✓	✓		
Lawrence Bear							✓		✓				
Leon Bear, Chairman Skull Valley Band of Goshute Indians						✓							
Margene Bullcreek	✓	✓			✓	✓				✓			
Michael Canning, Beehive Division of Wildlife					✓								
Kelly Casaday, Congressman Merrill Cook's Office									✓				
Steve Erickson, Downwinders			✓		✓	✓		✓		✓			✓
R.J. Hoffman									✓				
Orlando Jerez, Utah Department of Transportation													✓
Cindy King, Utah Chapter of the Sierra Club													✓

Commentor and affiliation (if any)	Transportation Impacts	Safety and Accidents	Cumulative Impacts	Emergency	Ecology	Cultural Resources	Socioeconomics	Alternatives	Need for the Facility	Geology & Soils	Hydrology	Decommissioning	Fed., State, & Local Permits
Al Mulder, Oregon/California Trails Association						✓							
Dianne Nielson, Utah Department of Environmental Quality	✓		✓				✓	✓					✓
William Patterson													
Justin Quigley, School Institutional Trust Land Administration							✓	✓					✓
Gary Sandquist	✓								✓				
Thomas See													
Greg Simonds, Ensign Ranches of Utah, L.C					✓		✓						
Joro Walker, Southern Wilderness Alliance					✓		✓						
Beverly White									✓				
Cherry Wong, Woman Concerned/ Utahns United	✓								✓				

Commentor and affiliation (if any)	Transportation Impacts	Safety and Accidents	Cumulative Impacts	Emergency	Ecology	Cultural Resources	Socioeconomics	Alternatives	Need for the Facility	Geology & Soils	Hydrology	Decommissioning	Fed., State, & Local Permits
Written Comments													
Lee Allison, Utah Geological Survey										✓			
Louise Hess													
John Paul Kennedy	✓	✓				✓	✓					✓	
Earl Morris, Utah Department of Public Safety				✓									
Dianne Nielson, Utah Department of Environmental Quality	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓		✓
Christopher Robinson, Ensign Ranches of Utah, L.C													
John Tanner, Jr.	✓	✓											
Joro Walker, Southern Wilderness Alliance, Ohngo Gaudadeh Devia, and Margene Bull Creek						✓	✓						
Cherry Wong and Rosemary Holt, Women Concerned/ Utahns United	✓								✓				

Attachment B

Proposed Outline for the Draft Environmental Impact Statement

**PROPOSED OUTLINE OF THE DRAFT EIS CONTENTS
PRIVATE FUEL STORAGE FACILITY, SKULL VALLEY INDIAN RESERVATION**

1. Purpose And Need
 - 1.1 Introduction
 - 1.2 The Proposed Project
 - 1.3 Need for the Proposed Project
 - 1.4 Scoping Process
 - 1.5 Cooperating Agencies
 - 1.5.1 NRC Federal Action
 - 1.5.2 BIA Federal Action
 - 1.5.3 BLM Federal Action
 - 1.6 Federal and State Authorities, Regulations, and Permits
2. Alternatives Including the Proposed Action
 - 2.1 Proposed Action
 - 2.1.1 Proposed Site and Facility Description
 - 2.1.1.1 Site Description
 - 2.1.1.2 Facility Description
 - 2.1.1.3 New Rail and ITF Description
 - 2.1.1.4 Land Use Requirements
 - 2.1.2 Operation
 - 2.1.2.1 Transportation of Spent Fuel to PFSF
 - 2.1.2.2 Proposed Storage Cask System
 - 2.1.3 Emissions, Effluents, and Solid Wastes
 - 2.1.4 Facility Closure and Decommissioning
 - 2.1.4.1 Storage Cask Decommissioning
 - 2.1.4.2 Storage Pad Decommissioning
 - 2.1.4.3 Decommissioning of Buildings and Other Structures
 - 2.2 Alternatives
 - 2.2.1 Alternatives to the Proposed ISFSI
 - 2.2.2 Alternate Technology
 - 2.2.3 Alternate Sites
 - 2.2.3.1 PFS Site Screening Methodology
 - 2.2.3.2 Site A at the Skull Valley Indian Reservation
 - 2.2.3.3 Site B at the Skull Valley Indian Reservation
 - 2.2.3.4 Fremont, Wyoming Site
 - 2.2.4 Local Transportation Alternatives
 - 2.2.4.1 Cross-Country Transportation Alternatives
 - 2.2.4.2 Local Transportation Alternatives
 - 2.2.5 No-action Alternative
 - 2.3 Comparison of Impacts Among Alternatives
3. Potentially Affected Environment Near the Skull Valley Site in Utah
 - 3.1 Geology and Soils
 - 3.1.1 Regional Geology
 - 3.1.2 Local Geology
 - 3.1.3 Seismic Setting
 - 3.1.4 Soils
 - 3.1.5 Mineral Resources
 - 3.2 Water Resources

- 3.2.1 Surface Water Hydrology and Quality
 - 3.2.1.1 General Site Setting
 - 3.2.1.2 Flooding
 - 3.2.2 Groundwater Hydrology and Quality
 - 3.2.3 Water Use
 - 3.3 Climatology and Air Quality
 - 3.3.1 Climate
 - 3.3.2 Air Quality
 - 3.4 Ecological Resources
 - 3.4.1 Terrestrial Resources
 - 3.4.1.1 Vegetation
 - 3.4.1.2 Wildlife
 - 3.4.2 Aquatic Resources
 - 3.4.2.1 Perennial and Intermittent Streams
 - 3.4.2.2 Wetlands
 - 3.4.3 Threatened, Endangered, and Other Special Status Species
 - 3.4.3.1 Plants
 - 3.4.3.2 Wildlife
 - 3.4.3.3 State and Federally Listed Species
 - 3.5 Socioeconomic and Community Resources
 - 3.5.1 Skull Valley/Goshute Indian Reservation
 - 3.5.2 Tooele County and Communities
 - 3.5.2.1 Land Use
 - 3.5.2.2 Population
 - 3.5.2.3 Employment and Economic Resources
 - 3.5.2.4 Community Resources
 - 3.6 Cultural Resources
 - 3.6.1 Cultural Background
 - 3.6.2 Archaeological, Native American, and Historic Properties
 - 3.6.2.1 Archaeological Properties
 - 3.6.2.2 Native American Properties
 - 3.6.2.3 Historic Properties
 - 3.7 Background Radiological Characteristics
 - 3.8 Other Environmental Features
 - 3.8.1 Ambient Noise Levels
 - 3.8.2 Scenic Qualities
 - 3.8.3 Recreation
4. Environmental Consequences
- 4.1 Potential Impacts of the Proposed Action and its Alternatives
 - 4.1.1 Geology and Soils
 - 4.1.1.1 Construction Impacts at the Preferred Site (Site A)
 - 4.1.1.2 Impacts during Operations at the Preferred Site
 - 4.1.1.3 The Alternative Site (Site B) in Skull Valley
 - 4.1.1.4 Cumulative Impacts
 - 4.1.1.5 Mitigation Measures
 - 4.1.2 Surface Water and Groundwater
 - 4.1.2.1 Construction Impacts at the Preferred Site (Site A)
 - 4.1.2.2 Impacts during Operations at the Preferred Site
 - 4.1.2.3 The Alternative Site (Site B) in Skull Valley
 - 4.1.2.4 Cumulative Impacts
 - 4.1.2.5 Mitigation Measures
 - 4.1.3 Air Quality

- 4.1.3.1 Construction Impacts at the Preferred Site (Site A)
 - 4.1.3.2 Impacts during Operation at the Preferred Site
 - 4.1.3.3 The Alternative Site (Site B) in Skull Valley
 - 4.1.3.4 Cumulative Impacts
 - 4.1.3.5 Mitigation Measures
- 4.1.4 Ecological Resources
 - 4.1.4.1 Construction Impacts at the Preferred Site (Site A)
 - 4.1.4.2 Impacts during Operation at the Preferred Site
 - 4.1.4.3 Impacts to Threatened, Endangered, and Other Species of Special Concern
 - 4.1.4.4 The Alternative Site (Site B) in Skull Valley
 - 4.1.4.5 Cumulative Impacts
 - 4.1.4.6 Mitigation Measures
- 4.1.5 Socioeconomics and Community Resources
 - 4.1.5.1 Construction Impacts at the Preferred Site (Site A)
 - 4.1.5.2 Impacts during Operation at the Preferred Site
 - 4.1.5.3 The Alternative Site (Site B) in Skull Valley
 - 4.1.5.4 Cumulative Impacts
 - 4.1.5.5 Mitigation Measures
- 4.1.6 Cultural Resources
 - 4.1.6.1 Construction Impacts at the Preferred Site (Site A)
 - 4.1.6.2 Impacts during Operation at the Preferred Site
 - 4.1.6.3 The Alternative Site (Site B) in Skull Valley
 - 4.1.6.4 Cumulative Impacts
 - 4.1.6.5 Mitigation Measures
- 4.1.7 Radiological Impacts
 - 4.1.7.1 Dose Evaluation Methods
 - 4.1.7.2 Dose Estimates for Routine Operations
 - 4.1.7.3 Off-Normal Operations and Accidents
- 4.1.8 Environmental Justice
 - 4.1.8.1 Demographics
 - 4.1.8.2 Assessment of Impacts
- 4.1.9 Other Impacts
 - 4.1.9.1 Noise
 - 4.1.9.2 Aesthetics
 - 4.1.9.3 Recreation
- 4.1.10 Decommissioning and Closure
- 4.2 Potential Impacts of the Proposed ISFSI at Alternate Site
 - 4.2.1 Geology
 - 4.2.2 Surface Water and Groundwater
 - 4.2.3 Air Quality
 - 4.2.4 Ecological Resources
 - 4.2.5 Socioeconomics and Community Resources
 - 4.2.6 Cultural Resources
 - 4.2.7 Radiological Impacts
 - 4.2.8 Environmental Justice
 - 4.2.9 Other Impacts
 - 4.2.10 Decommissioning and Closure
- 4.3 Potential Impacts of the No-Action Alternative
 - 4.3.1 Geology and Soils
 - 4.3.2 Surface Water and Groundwater
 - 4.3.3 Air Quality
 - 4.3.4 Ecological Resources

- 4.3.5 Socioeconomic and Community Resources
- 4.3.6 Cultural Resources
- 4.3.7 Radiological Impacts
- 4.3.8 Cross-Country Transportation Impacts
- 4.3.9 Environmental Justice
- 4.3.10 Other Impacts
- 4.4 Monitoring Programs
- 4.5 Unavoidable Adverse Environmental Impacts
 - 4.5.1 Soils and Mineral Resources
 - 4.5.2 Surface Water and Groundwater
 - 4.5.3 Air Quality
 - 4.5.4 Ecological Resources
 - 4.5.5 Socioeconomic and Community Resources
 - 4.5.6 Cultural Resources
 - 4.5.7 Radiological Impacts
 - 4.5.8 Environmental Justice
 - 4.5.9 Other Impacts
 - 4.5.9.1 Noise
 - 4.5.9.2 Aesthetics
 - 4.5.9.3 Recreation
- 4.6 Relationship Between Short-Term Uses of the Environment and Long-Term Productivity
- 4.7 Irreversible and Irretrievable Commitment of Resources
- 5. Transportation Impacts
 - 5.1 Introduction
 - 5.2 Cross-Country Transportation
 - 5.3 Regional Transportation
 - 5.4 Construction and Operation Transportation Impacts in Skull Valley
 - 5.5 Alternate Site Regional Transportation Impacts
 - 5.6 Sabotage
 - 5.7 Environmental Justice
- 6. Cost-Benefit Analysis
 - 6.1 Economic Costs and Benefits of Constructing and Operating the Proposed Facility
 - 6.2 Other Costs and Benefits
 - 6.3 Cost-Benefit Summary
- 7. Staff Assessment
- 8. Agencies Consulted
- 9. List of Preparers
- 10. References
- 11. Index

Appendix A: Scoping for this Environmental Impact Statement

Appendix B: Consultation Letters

Appendix C: Route Listings for Rail Routes to the Proposed PFSF Site

Appendix D: Comments on the Draft EIS and Responses to Those Comments